Tab 39

Hey Bob,
Thanks for the message. I initially thought the same thing and had Armstrong run a comparison on lean mass changes b/t groups. Unfortunately, BOTH groups increased lean mass from pre to post testing. And although the increase in the XEN group was 161% greater (+ 1.08 kg) than the increase in the placebo group (+ 0.67 kg), the diffs were not "statistically" significant (probably due to variance in responses). However, in my opinion, this effect does warrant mentioning in the full paper.
As far as re-writing the abstract, since I am not recognized as a co-author on the study I am not allowed to do it. I can certainly write up something for Extreme Mag or another lay publication, but the scientific pub part of it is in Armstrong's hands (unfortunately). In fact, I'm sure he considers it "his" data. In this case the best I can do is try to carefully nudge his interpretation/writing in Cytodyne's favor. However, knowing Jeff this would likely be a complex, protracted process. Speaking of work...
Initially, I was able to work through EMU issues/problems with with only a modest investment of time. Lately, however, coordinating the design and budget of projects at Winona State, Kent State, and the Univ. of Chichester (Dr. Roger Harris) has changed my time investment substantially. In fact, handling these issues is exactly the type of thing that I had in mind relative to being hired as a consultant. Perhaps now is the time to begin a detailed discussion about bringing me on the "team"?
Finally, no, except for an abstract I have not seen Dr. Colker's Xenadrine study. Would it be possible for someone there to mail me a copy? My address is: 4100 Scotch Pine Ct, Perry OH 44081
Talk to you soon.
Best wishes,
Tim

Court's Ex. 1311
Case # GIC768364
Rec'd
Dept 56 Clk

>From: BobC@prosourceonline.com
>To: tzphd@hotmail.com
>Subject: RE: EMU XEN study
>Date: Mon, 13 Nov 2000 12:54:07 -0500
>
>Hi Tim,
>
>This looks much better. I'm also wondering if the variance between the
>bodyweight change and the fat-mass change is indicative of a significant
>muscle sparing effect. Does the data give us something to go on there?
>
>Also, do you think it is possible to rewrite an abstract based on your
>interpretation that we could submit for publication? Essentially, the
>abstract would summarize the points in this e-mail and would also again
>confirm the safety of the product within the confines of the study.
>
>Lastly, before we would do anything with such an abstract, we would need to
>make sure that there is no data in this study which would conflict with data
>from the previous Colker study. Do you have a copy of that study so that
>you could do a side by side comparison? Obviously, the protocols are
>different which would create some expected differences.

-Bob

-----Original Message-----

CT 07906

> From: Tim Ziegenfuss [SMTP:tzphd@hotmail.com]
> Sent: Thursday, November 09, 2000 2:32 PM
> To: Bobc@prosourceonline.com
> Cc: kpconklin@aol.com
> Subject: EMU XEN study
>
> Hello Guys,
>
> Just thought you might want to hear MY INTERPRETATION of the EMU
>study. Dr.
> Armstrong sent me the entire report, with all the #s, and it looks
>much
> better than any us expected - and particularly what he originally
> communicated to Kelly. For instance, I know using percentages can
>be
> misleading (especially when the absolute changes are small), but
>check this
> out:
>
> BODY WEIGHT CHANGE
>
> XEN -1.45 kg (3.19 lb)
>
> PLACEBO +0.22 kg (0.5 lb)
>
> That's 759% more weight loss in the XEN group!
>
>
> FAT MASS CHANGE
>
> XEN -2.57 (5.7 lb)
>
> PLACEBO -0.49 (1.08 lb)
>
> That's 524% more fat loss in the XEN group!
>
>
> And these effects occurred despite no statistically "significant"
>changes in
> either groups' dietary intake. However, if you look at the actual
>#s, the
> PLACEBO group actually reduced their total caloric intake by 200
>kcals/day
> and their fat intake by 30 grams/day from pre to post testing. Had
>this not
> happened, the above changes would've been even MORE dramatic.

DAMN I'M GOOD.....

CT 07907